

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claims 1-18 are rejected.

Claims 1, 6, and 11-14 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 12 and 13 appear to inadvertently depend on claim 12.

The clerical error of these claims has been corrected by amendment above.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalrymple et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,272) in view of Maruyama et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,847 B1).

Maruyama does not teach or show a gatekeeper. For example, in FIGS. 1 and 2 a main processor (1) and call processors (20 to 2n) are connected via a bus (col. 3, lines 38-40). Absent, however, is a gatekeeper. Also, although multiple call processors (20 to 2n) are shown, Maruyama is primarily concerned only with call load prediction (Abstract), and not on-the-fly call processing.

Dalrymple shows a gatekeeper (104), but it is not directly connected to the gateway (103), but instead a user proxy (105) intervenes, as clearly shown in FIGS. 1, 3, 5, and 7. Furthermore, Dalrymple only teaches a single call processor 104, and is directed to allowing a user to route a portion of the call data through a gateway, not the call data itself.

Claims 1, 6, and 11-14 have been amended to further clarify their subject matter. These claims now recite either a direct connection between a gateway and a gatekeeper or receiving a call setup message directly from a gatekeeper. No new matter is added. Support can be found, among other locations, on page 5, line 2, page 7, line 26, and FIG. 1.

For the reasons discussed above, the combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. For example, the combination of Maruyama with Dalrymple does not teach a network device with multiple call processors and a direct communication with a gatekeeper. Therefore allowance of all claims is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Mail Stop
Amendment Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22231-1450
Date: June 28, 2005


Adrienne Chocholak